



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,818	12/12/2000	Sunil Contractor	BELL-0061/00230	2086

7590 02/14/2003

Jonathan M. Waldman  
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ  
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,818

Applicant(s)

CONTRACTOR, SUNIL

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1, 13, 17 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The phrase “wherein said called party is not a customer of said voice messaging system” of claims 1, 13, 17 and 30 are not disclosed by the specification. On line 10 page 13 the specifications disclosed “the called party is then provided with an indication that a message is waiting for him”. The quoted specification phrase reads on that the called party is a customer of the voice messaging system otherwise the indication of a message waiting will not be provided.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 5-8, 17, 19, 20, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rubin et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,778,052).

For claims 1 and 17, regarding a service switching point connected to said telephone with said called line number, said service switching point comprising a trigger responsive to a busy status on said called line number, Rubin et al teach on item 26 Fig. 1 SSP and item 28 Fig. 1 destination party telephone number. Rubin et al also teach on Column 1 Line 47 the status of the telephone call is monitored to determine a busy or unanswered condition at the destination party telephone number. If the destination party telephone number is busy or unanswered, a message from the calling party can be recorded within the network database, which can be part of a service control point in the switched telephone network. It is inherent that the SSP must comprise

Art Unit: 2645

a trigger (to the SCP and the calling party) for message recording in response to a busy status. Regarding a signal transfer point adapted to communicate with said service switching point, Rubin et al teach on item 69 Fig. 2 STP. Regarding a service control point adapted to communicate with said signal transfer point, said service control point containing a database, Rubin et al teach on item 48 Fig. 2 SCP. Rubin et al also teach on item 82 Fig. 3 disk subsystem. The disk subsystem of Rubin is the claimed database. Regarding a service node connected to said service switching point through a first data link, and connected to said service control point through a second data link, Rubin et al teach on item 50 Fig. 2 SMS. The SMS and disk subsystem together of Rubin is the claimed "service node". Rubin et al also teach on Fig. 2. The connection between SMS and SSP (via SCP and STP) is the claimed "first data link". The connection between SMS and SCP is the claimed "second data link". Regarding service node is adapted to receive said message from said calling party into a voice messaging system when said called line number has a busy status, store said message, and deliver said message to said called party responsive to a request from said called party; and wherein said called party is not a customer of said voice messaging system, Rubin et al teach on Column 1 Line 50 a message from the calling party can be recorded within the network database (the claimed voice messaging system), which can be part of a service control point. It is inherent that the service node must receive the message from calling party for transmitting to a voice messaging system. Rubin et al also teach on Column 5 Line 40 to receive a forwarded message a destination party may be required to enter a PIN or other identifier to obtain access to the stored message. The "receive a forwarded message" of Rubin reads on the claimed "deliver said message". The "enter a PIN" of Rubin is the claimed "a request".

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Rubin et al teach on Column 1 Line 57 the recorded message can be forwarded to one or more telephone numbers ..... at a later time according to a specified date and time received from the calling party. The “date and time received from the calling party” of Rubin et al is the claimed “calling party has granted permission to send”. Rubin et al also teach on Column 5 Line 36 at the selected date and time, the message forwarding system in the switched telephone network forwards the message. It is inherent that the service node (part of the switched telephone network; item 20 of Fig. 2) must determine the time and date to forward the message.

Regarding claim 6, Rubin et al teach on Column 3 Line 45 the service switching point is operable to (i) recognize service requirements and requests. The “recognize service requirements and requests” of Rubin et al is the claimed “determine whether said calling party has granted permission”.

Regarding claim 7, Rubin et al teach on Column 4 Line 29 the service management system (the claimed service node) is a management and provisioning system that serves as an intelligent network service administration platform. Rubin et al also teach on Column 3 Line 20 processing ... comprises: ... (ii) processing collected information to determine if a message ought to be and can be recorded. The “information to determine” of Rubin is the claimed “predetermined input”. The “message ought to be and can be recorded” of Rubin reads on the claimed “said message is forthcoming”.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Rubin et al teach on Column 5 Line 19 a query to a network database such as a service control point so as to obtain message recording instructions. The “message recording instruction” of Rubin et al is the claimed “prompt”.

Regarding claim 28, Rubin et al teach on Column 1 Line 44 a telephone call initiated by a calling party and being routed to a destination party telephone number ..... The status of the telephone call is monitored to determine a busy or unanswered condition ....If the destination party telephone number is busy or unanswered, a message from the calling party can be recorded.

Regarding claim 29, Rubin et al teach on Column 5 Line 40 to receive a forwarded message a destination party may be required to enter a PIN. The “enter a PIN” of Rubin et al is the claimed “receiving said request”.

3. Claims 13, 15, 16, 30, 31, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McConnell (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,306).

For claim 13, 30, and 31, regarding a home location register adapted to communicate with a mobile switching center, McConnell teaches on item 26 Fig. 1 HLR. The HLR of McConnell is the claimed home location register. Regarding said mobile switching center adapted to communicate with a plurality of cell sites, said mobile switching center comprising a trigger responsive to a busy status on said called line number. McConnell teaches on item 20 Fig. 1 MSC. The MSC is the claimed mobile switching center. McConnell also teaches on Column 5

Art Unit: 2645

Line 32 if an incoming call directed to the mobile phone is not answered or if the phone is busy the MSC queries the SCP or HLR and receives instructions to route the call to the wireless voicemail. The “queries” of McConnell is the claimed “trigger”. Regarding plurality of cell sites adapted to communicate with a plurality of wireless telephones, McConnell teaches on Column 1 Line 52 a plurality of landline and wireless phones. Regarding a single transfer point adapted to communicate with said mobile switching centers and said home location registers, McConnell teaches on item 22 Fig. 1 STP. Regarding a service control point adapted to communicate with said signal transfer point, McConnell teaches on item 24 Fig. 1 SCP. Regarding a service node adapted to communicate with said signal transfer point and to communicate with said mobile switching center, McConnell teaches on item 28 Fig. 1 Wireless VM. The wireless VM of McConnell is the claimed service node. It is inherent that the wireless messaging system must receive, store, and forward the message.

Regarding claims 15 and 35, McConnell teaches on Column 4 Line 1 invoke customized message waiting notification announcements.

Regarding claim 16, McConnell teaches on Fig. 1 the connection between STP and item 54 is the claimed data link.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Walsh et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,797,124). Rubin et al failed to teach said request from said called party is a call from said called line number to said voice message system. However, Walsh et al teach on Column 3 Line 37 the subscriber calls in to retrieve messages. The “subscriber calls in” of Walsh reads “subscriber calls in from, including, called line number”. It is inherent that the call must be made to the claimed voice messaging system in order to retrieve the voice messages. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have said request from said called party is a call from said called line number to said voice message system as taught by Walsh et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support a call from said called line number to said voice messaging system to the system users.

5. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Garner et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,475,737). Rubin et al failed to teach a message waiting indication to said called party. However, Garner et al teach on Column 11 Line 63 the system will provide a message waiting indication. It would have been

Art Unit: 2645

obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have a message waiting indication to said called party as taught by Garner et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support a message waiting indication to the system users.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of McConnell (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,306). Rubin failed to teach a third data link connected to said signal transfer point and adapted to communicate with a wireless telephone system. However, McConnell teaches on item 22 (STP) and item 14 (BTS) Fig. 1. The BTS of McConnell is the claimed wireless telephone system. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have a third data link connected to said signal transfer point and adapted to communicate with a wireless telephone system as taught by McConnell such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support a third data link to communicate with a wireless telephone system to the system users.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Pelletier et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,411,704). Rubin failed to teach said service node comprises said voice messaging system. However, Pelletier et al teach on item 28 Fig. 4 "service node voice mail". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have service node comprises said voice messaging system as taught by Pelletier et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support service node comprises said voice messaging system to the system users.

Art Unit: 2645

8. Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Alger et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,396,542). Rubin et al failed to teach said service node is adapted to prompt said calling party with at least one message option. However, Alger et al teach on Column 2 Line 30 system may be implemented using a switching system together with a switch adjunct, e.g., a service node. Alger et al also teach on Column 4 Line 25 – Line 32. The caller is given a brief prompt with at least one message option. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have said service node is adapted to prompt said calling party with at least one message option as taught by Alger et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support the prompt with at least one message option to the system users.

9. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin and Alger et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Alger et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,396,542). Rubin and Alger et al failed to teach said prompt comprises audible voice notification. However, Alger et al also teach on Column 4 Line 25 – Line 32. The caller is given a brief prompt (the claimed audible voice notification). It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin and Alger to have said prompt comprises audible voice notification as taught by Alger et al such that the modified system of Rubin and Alger would be able to support the audible voice notification to the system users.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Alger et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,396,542). Rubin et al failed

Art Unit: 2645

to teach said service node is adapted to receive at least one message option from said calling party via one of either telephone keypad entry and voice recognition. However, Alger et al teach on Column 8 Line 27 an automatic speech recognition system could monitor for certain key words. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have said service node is adapted to receive at least one message option from said calling party via one of either telephone keypad entry and voice recognition as taught by Alger et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support the voice recognition to the system users.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Walsh et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,797,124). McConnell failed to teach said request from said called party is a call from said called line number to said voice message system. However, Walsh et al teach on Column 3 Line 37 the subscriber calls in to retrieve messages. The "subscriber calls in" of Walsh reads "subscriber calls in from, including, called line number". It is inherent that the call must be made to the claimed voice messaging system in order to retrieve the voice messages. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify McConnell to have said request from said called party is a call from said called line number to said voice message system as taught by Walsh et al such that the modified system of McConnell would be able to support a call from said called line number to said voice messaging system to the system users.

Art Unit: 2645

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 10 above, and in view of Alger et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,396,542). Rubin et al failed to teach said prompt comprises audible voice notification. However, Alger et al also teach on Column 4 Line 25 – Line 32. The caller is given a brief prompt (the claimed audible voice notification). It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to have said prompt comprises audible voice notification as taught by Alger et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support the audible voice notification to the system users.

13. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin and Alger et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Alger et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,396,542). Rubin and Alger et al failed to teach said service node is adapted to receive at least one message option from said calling party via one of either telephone keypad entry and voice recognition. However, Alger et al teach on Column 8 Line 27 an automatic speech recognition system could monitor for certain key words. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin and Alger to have said service node is adapted to receive at least one message option from said calling party via one of either telephone keypad entry and voice recognition as taught by Alger et al such that the modified system of Rubin and Alger would be able to support the voice recognition to the system users.

14. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et al as applied to claim 17 above, and in view of Troen-Krasnow et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,442,250). Rubin

Art Unit: 2645

et al failed to teach determining if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party. However, Troen-Krasnow et al teach on Column 6 Line 5 group access unit may prohibit any subscriber from sending a message to a group that is not associated with the subscriber's subscriber ID. The "prohibit any subscriber from sending a message" reads on "determining if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin to determine if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party as taught by Troen-Krasnow et al such that the modified system of Rubin would be able to support the determining if said calling party is a customer to the system users.

15. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin and Troen-Krasnow et al as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Troen-Krasnow et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,442,250). Rubin et al failed to teach determining if said calling party is a customer comprises comparing said calling party to a predetermined plurality of authorized calling parties. However, Troen-Krasnow et al teach on Column 6 Line 5 group access unit may prohibit any subscriber from sending a message to a group that is not associated with the subscriber's subscriber ID. The "prohibit any subscriber from sending a message to a group that is not associated with the subscriber's subscriber ID" reads on "comparing said calling party to a predetermined plurality of authorized calling parties". The group that is associated with the subscriber's subscriber ID is the claimed authorized calling parties. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rubin and Troen-Krasnow to

Art Unit: 2645

determine if said calling party is a customer comprises comparing said calling party to a predetermined plurality of authorized calling parties as taught by Troen-Krasnow et al such that the modified system of Rubin and Troen-Krasnow et al would be able to support the comparing said calling party to a predetermined plurality of authorized calling parties to the system users.

16. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell as applied to claim 30 above, and in view of Troen-Krasnow et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,442,250). McConnell et al failed to teach determining if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party. However, Troen-Krasnow et al teach on Column 6 Line 5 group access unit may prohibit any subscriber from sending a message to a group that is not associated with the subscriber's subscriber ID. The "prohibit any subscriber from sending a message" reads on "determining if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify McConnell to determine if said calling party is a customer, and only if so, receiving said message from said calling party as taught by Troen-Krasnow et al such that the modified system of McConnell would be able to support the determining if said calling party is a customer to the system users.

17. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell as applied to claim 30 above, and in view of Rubin et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,778,052). McConnell failed to teach prompting said calling party for said message. However, Rubin et al teach on Column 5 Line 19 a query to a network database such as a service control point so as to obtain

Art Unit: 2645

message recording instructions. The “message recording instruction” of Rubin et al is the claimed “prompting”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify McConnell to have prompting said calling party for said message as taught by Rubin et al such that the modified system of McConnell would be able to support the prompting to the system users.

18. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell as applied to claim 30 above, and in view of Rubin et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,778,052). McConnell failed to teach prior to receiving said message from said calling party, dialing said called line number and determining if a busy status is received, and if so, prompting said calling party for said message. However, Rubin et al teach on Column 1 Line 44 a telephone call initiated by a calling party and being routed to a destination party telephone number ..... The status of the telephone call is monitored to determine a busy or unanswered condition ....If the destination party telephone number is busy or unanswered, a message from the calling party can be recorded. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify McConnell to have prior to receiving said message from said calling party, dialing said called line number and determining if a busy status is received, and if so, prompting said calling party for said message as taught by Rubin et al such that the modified system of McConnell would be able to support the dialing said called line number and determining if a busy status is received prior to receiving said message to the system users.



*Response to Arguments*

19. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/11/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

i) Applicant argues, on page 5, regarding claims 1, 13, 17 and 30 about the limitation “deliver said message to said called party responsive to a request from said called party”. However, Rubin et al teach on Abstract “a destination party can access the message if authorized”. When the destination party (the claimed “called party”) accesses, the destination party requests the message and the message is delivered (when authorized) to the destination party.

ii) Applicant argues, on page 6, regarding the amended limitation “wherein said called party is not a customer of said voice messaging system”. However, this amended limitation is not supported by the specifications. On line 10 page 13 the specifications disclosed “the called party is then provided with an indication that a message is waiting for him”. The quoted specification phrase reads on that the called party is a customer of the voice messaging system otherwise the indication of a message waiting will not be provided.

*Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2645

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 09/734,818

Page 18

Art Unit: 2645

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

